

| | | | |
|---|--|-------------------------------------|--|
| Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary | Application No. 09/671,636 | Applicant(s) DRESS ET AL. | |
| | Examiner Sudhanshu C. Pathak | Art Unit 2611 | |

All Participants:
Status of Application: _____

 (1) Sudhanshu C. Pathak.

 (3) Stephen Smith.

 (2) John Bruckner.

(4) _____.

Date of Interview: 4 May 2006
Time: afternoon
Type of Interview:

- ☒ Telephonic
☐ Video Conference
☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant ☐ Applicant's representative)

Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: ☐ Yes ☐ No

If Yes, provide a brief description:

Part I.
Rejection(s) discussed:

Yes

Claims discussed:

Yes

Prior art documents discussed:

Yes

Part II.
SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED:
See Continuation Sheet
Part III.

- ☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.
☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.

 (Examiner/SPE Signature)

 (Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: Bascially, with the inventor Dr. Smith it was determined that the orthogonality of the prior art was over an intergration over an intergral multiple of the chip rate and the instant application the orthogonality was over the bit rate i.e. the intergration time for orthogonality is T_b . Furthermore, the claims were discussed so as to avoid 112 issues..